Here are a few theory shells that I wrote (Paras Kumar helped with CX checks bad). I extemped theory a lot so I don’t have too many written down, but I hope these can be helpful! Though some of these aren’t the best shells, most of them have been read in round before.

I know two of these are contradictory; I changed my mind a lot over the course of the season ☺

Reps Spec

1. Interpretation – The affirmative must defend a specific policy or method of implementation for reparations. To clarify – the affirmative cannot just say that reparations are good or that African americans are owed reparations, rather they need to specify to methods of reparations. You can meet my interp by defending cash transfers, land transfers, congressional passed apologies, etc.
2. Violation –
3. Standards
4. Strat Skew – Defending reparations in general destroys negative strategy – there is no consensus on their form in the squo. Brophy[[1]](#footnote-1)

Most people who talk about reparations as a serious goal envision a whole-sale reordering of American society. Their agenda includes redistribution of wealth and breakdown of racism and white privilege. How the later goals will be accomplished is rarely specified. Indeed, a critical problem with reparations is that reparationists have not yet specified what they want. 79 And it is exceedingly difficult to get somewhere until you know where it is you are going. Or, as Arthur Serota has phrased the problem, "Revolutions cannot work without a realistic finance plan."80 ° We have some statements, such as Clarence J. Munford's in Race and Reparations that we should "demand it all!"81 Even Robert Westley, who is a brilliant scholar and leading theorist of reparations, does not provide a comprehensive plan. He does, however, offer a somewhat more detailed picture than most other reparations articles. He sees [some see] monetary payments to individuals, as well as commitment to community-building programs as central to the reparations agenda.82 His goal is "black economic independence from societal discrimination" and civil equality.8 3 That will occur through two ways. First, the people most in need will receive cash payments. He makes no attempt to specify the amount of those payments. Those payments must await, one suspects, some assessment of the damage that will flow in turn from the truth commissions that will study reparations. Second, Westley proposes the establishment of a trust fund, with trustees elected by African-American descendants of slaves. Westley acknowledges that his plan needs considerable refinement.8 4 In fact, now is a good time to begin to explore such a plan in more detail. Randall Robinson, who bases much of his legal argument on Westley, also proposes a trust fund. The exact amount of the trust, Robinson believes, should be determined once "an assessment can be made of what it will cost to repair the long-term social damage. ' 85 Robinson proposes that the trust fund provide for at least two generations of precollege education (with boarding schools for at-risk children), college for those who cannot afford it, and additional weekend schools that teach "the diverse histories and cultures of the black world. 8 6 He also proposes the following: a study of the extent to which companies and families have been enriched by slavery, followed by recovery of that money, which would be reinvested in the trust; funding of black civil rights and political organizations; and commitments to Carribean and African countries, including "full debt relief, fair trade terms, and significant monetary compensation. ' 87 But that is only the beginning, not a comprehensive plan.88 Professor Molefi Kete Asante provides a similar statement to Westley about the range of potential reparations strategies: "Among the potential options are educational grants, health care, land or property grants, and a combination of such grants. Any reparations remedy should deal with long-term issues in the African-American community rather than a onetime cash payout. '89 Other reparations plans are more outlandish. Perhaps the most radical plan that I have seen is that of Lee Harris, who adopts the black nationalist perspective. He proposes establishment of separate states for blacks. The proposal, which would almost surely require a constitutional amendment, is radical indeed. It is reminiscent of Nation of Islam's Lewis Farrakan's statement at the reparations rally in the summer of 2002: "We cannot settle for some little jive token. We need millions of acres that black people can build." 90 It is easier to state aspirational goals, rather than concrete plans. But sometimes even the general goals are hard to articulate. Perhaps Arthur Serota has given us the best statement of what reparations promise: [T]here can be no elimination of poverty in America, no rebuilding of lives for millions of Black Americans sweltering in urban chaos and isolated by rural deprivation, no chance for millions of urban black youth staring through prison bars, hiding from warrants, dropping out of school or negotiating the violence of urban battlefields, to contemplate and develop their futures without reparations. Reparations is not merely long overdue, it is a finance plan to implement a change.9

Thus, the aff can sever out of all negative indicts by claiming that the neg misunderstands the type of reparations, that the neg’s arguments don’t link to the specific aff, etc. Preventing strategy skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against their opponent to access the ballot

1. Critical Ground – The reparations debate isn’t about whether they are needed – it focuses on the method of reparations. Nuruddin[[2]](#footnote-2) 1

Now that the demand for reparations has been embraced by the black establishment, and thereby made reputable and legitimate in the eyes of the black bourgeoisie as well as in the eyes of the non-advanced sector of the masses who rely upon the imprimatur of “bona fide” black leaders, a groundswell has been achieved. With the exception of literally a handful of Thomasian black conservatives who view reparations as but another entitlement program which fosters a sense of dependency and victimization that is detrimental to black progress, there is near unanimity in the African American community on this issue. The black managerial and professional class, the black working class and the black lumpen all want reparations; blacks regardless of their ideology -- integrationist-assimilationist, nationalist-separatist, Marxists-Leninist, feminist, or Afrocentrist -- all want reparations. There is a surety of victory in the air, a sense of invincibility that emerges from the heady combination of moral authority (we must be compensated for this crime against humanity!) and unflinching solidarity. Yet it is certain that class contradictions will emerge as the movement becomes more focused on the logistics of implementing reparations. How that the resulting struggle is conducted will have great bearing on state of Blackamerica for decades to come. In fact, we would be remiss if we did not recognize that the fashioning of the class character of reparations policy, will be the one of the monumentally decisive moments in the entire course of African American history. That conflicting class interests ---those of the working class, upper middle class, and underclass – would emerge in the struggle for reparations should not be surprising. Struggles for national liberation always have internal class conflicts. The principle of unity and struggle defines the working class strategy in national liberation struggles. In other words, the black working class must unite with the black bourgeoisie in the struggle to gain reparations from white America, but black workers must struggle against the bourgeoisie for control of the specific reparations agenda. In the face of white supremacy, the unity of African people is an absolute necessity. But emotional calls for black unity, often becloud the conflictual class interests that exists within Blackamerica. Because the transfer of wealth involved in a just reparations settlement would not be trivial, it is important that the black working class, move in a Lukacsian sense from being “a class in itself” to “a class for itself ,“ in short, that it become conscious of it’s particular interests and organize around a reparations agenda which represents these interests. Reparations settlements could involve individual cash payments, investments in community development projects, the transfer of land, tax exemptions, tuition-exemptions or any combination of these factors. The way reparations settlements are structured could be more advantageous to one class than another. It is often argued that class divisions among African Americans is largely fictional, that there is no real black bourgeoisie – that at best Afroamerica has a class of petty bourgeoisie or even lumpenbourgeoisie , i.,e, tenuous struggling sub-bourgeoisie, who are “one paycheck away from being homeless,” i.e., if laid off or fired they would not be able to make their mortgage payments. I argue there are substantial class differences among African Americans and that the internal struggle for the shape of reparations will sharpen these real differences. We cannot masquerade ideological differences either, some demands for reparations have a more revolutionary character to them than others. Some formulations of reparations are consumer-oriented palliatives while others challenge the very legitimacy of the existing nation-state (perhaps pre-maturely). In launching a reparations movement it is necessary that we be very conscious of the class issues and the ideological issues that shape the various types of reparations demands.

This also non-uniques the advantages of the aff – academia already recognizes the need for reparations. Critical ground is key to fairness because it ensures that the neg can contest the aff.

1. Resistance
2. Debate about the structure of reparations is key to long term coalition building and overcoming racism. Nuruddin[[3]](#footnote-3) 2

This is why I stated in the beginning of this paper that the way we structure reparations will be one of the most momentous decisions in the history of the African American people. A lot of energy has been expended on (1) how we should get reparations, e.g., via litigation or legislation and (2) who should pay private corporations or governments. 38 (Some diligent researchers have even traced the network of companies, banks and insurance companies which profited from the slave trade 39). All of this is good and necessary work . Now we must get to the job of deciding what a reparations program must look like. Maulana Karenga in his wisdom stated that we must initiate a national black and white dialogue on the issue of reparations; and that that national conversation must not merely focus on the calculation of monetary compensation, but instead on focus on the moral and ethical issues of the holocaust of slavery which was a monstrous crime against humanity. For Karenga, reparations must have five components: (1) admission of the moral wrong, (2) apology, (3) recognition in the form of national monuments/ memorials, (3) compensation and (5) measures to prevent future racism.40 No one could argue with this; but I would add that as we initiate this national inter-racial dialogue in public forums such as this journal; that as a act of self-determination (kujichagalia) African Americans must also initiate national dialogues amongst ourselves. This internal dialogue must result in the shaping of our own policy about what the package of compensation should look like. Those of us who were not well grounded in the community empowerment/community control struggles of the 1960s , would do well to prepare themselves for such an internal dialogue by reviewing the literature of community control41 To this end of initiating this internal dialogue and creating a body of grassroots brothers and sisters who can formulate the policy for, and oversee the implementation of, a national reparations compensation program, Amiri Baraka has called for a National Representative Assembly, a democratically elected congress or parliament representative of the masses of African American working class people.42 The people who would be elected would not be the typical slate of sleazy and corrupt politicians who have misrepresented our interests over and over again in the past. This slate would come from the tried and true community activist and organizers and neighborhood leaders who have demonstrated commitment and dedication to the struggle of African people. . the people who are our statesmen. Frantz Fanon stated “That every generation, out of relative obscurity, must discover its mission and either fulfill it or betray it.” Our mission is to secure the resources to build a self-sufficient and independent community. Reparations and Self-governance must go hand in hand.. This is how we will insure and protect our collective interests, for ourselves and for our future generations, so that as Maulana Karenga so often says ”We can once again step back on the stage of human history as a free, proud and productive people.” Marcus Garvey told us: “Up You Mighty Race, you can accomplish what you will” 43 With the proper administration , the proper management, the proper governance of the reparations resources, we can. Reparations: It’s not about getting’ paid. It’s about Nation Time.

1. Forcing the debate to be about whether blacks deserve reparations halts progress against racism and makes the neg complicit with whiteness. Henry[[4]](#footnote-4)

Third, reparations has enabled its advocates to assume the moral higher ground lost after the civil rights movement. To a large extent, White opposition to an apology for slavery is a refusal to concede the higher ground. David Gresson argued, "The racial liberation movement and its companion liberation movements represented losses for white men as moral heroes; the emotional and symbolic aspects of this loss, moreover, were greater than any material loss the American dominant majority sustained" (as cited in McPhail, 2002, p. 189). "Increasingly,"s ays Gresson, "whites experienced themselves as oppressed victims of an uncaring authority and cited efforts on behalf of Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans and other ethnics as 'reverse racism'-the birth cry of modem white racial recovery rhetoric" (as cited in McPhail, 2002, pp. 189-190). In short, the current reparations movement has achieved a rhetorical unity that has put its opponents on the defensive.

Thus the aff fosters counterproductive discussion – the neg is forced into defending whiteness instead of engaging the aff to develop solutions to racism.

Resistance is key to fairness because provides the base of all offense and advocacies that debaters read in round – any fiat is to redress a real world problem.

1. Voter – Fairness

AC Spikes Must be Paradigmatic

1. Interpretaiton – the Affirmative must only include paradigmatic theory spikes in the AC, meaning reasons why theory is drop the arg/debater, competing interps/reasonability, and RVI’s. The AC cannot have other theory spikes or defend explicit interps
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Neg Flex – AC spikes destroy negative flexibility. The aff can read any no risk interp in their case and I’m forced to engage in them before I can access offense. And it doesn’t matter that I can debate under your interps – in your world the aff reads theory spikes that prevent the neg from generating effective offense. Neg flex is key to fairness because it ensures that the neg can check the aff’s prep advantage and develop substantive strategies.
5. Norms – spikes in the AC harm norming for two reasons

a) Theoretical spikes lead to lower quality norms. The aff fills the AC with a variety of theory arguments to increase the probability that the neg undercovers or drops one. This prevents norm setting, as theory is decided by tech of a spike being dropped rather than the truth of an interp

b) Reading interps and offensive theory in the 1AR is key to check back real abuse. If the aff’s spikes are actually good for debate there’s no reason they need to start the theory debate in the AC. Reading theory in the 1Ar is key to ensure the shells aren’t frivolous, as the 1AR is time crunched and can’t waste time on arguments with a low probability of accessing the ballot

Norms are key to any voter because it ensures effective enforcement of theoretical rules and that theory debates are resolvable.

Mindset Alts Bad

1. Interpretation: Kritik alternatives must only be specific, solvent policy actions implemented by a single actor. The alt must have a solvency advocate that explains the implementation of the policy, and cannot fiat a rejection, mindset shift, or (*what they did*)
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Strat Skew – Mindset alts skew my strategy because a) I don’t know how the shift is implemented so the neg can delink from solvency deficits and link turn and b) I don’t know what mindset replaces it, so the neg can sever out of impact turns to the k. Preventing strat skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against opponents to access the ballot. Strat skew also turns the K; if my opponent is vague and shifty then they don’t actually believe in the discourse and are being disingenuous.
5. Reciprocity – without a concrete policy action alt with solvency, they can win by only showing something bad about my advocacy or state of affairs, and then claim utopian fiat through mindset shift. For example, I can’t show that the world of the alt is more capitalist if the alt is “reject capitalism” which destroys my ability to turn the K, making the entire position functionally an a priori, destroying fairness since winning any disadvantage to the aff is sufficient to win but I cant prove a disadvantage to their world. The only way to solve this would be to give the aff utopian fiat, in which case I fiat away all of their disadvantages and all of my advantages, meaning I win on a post-fiat level and outweigh the K.

No Pic Employer

1. Interpretation – The neg must not fiat that certain employers be exempt from living wage requirements. To clarify the interpretation the negative must not run a pic that defends the entirety of the aff plan or advocacy but creates an exception for a specific type of employer, industry, sector, or job.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Predictability – Pic’ing out of specific industries destroys my ability to predict neg strategy. The economy is huge- there are hundreds if not thousands of possible pics in his interpretation. Langager[[5]](#footnote-5) explains

A sector is one of a few general segments in the economy within which a large group of companies can be categorized. An economy can be broken down into about a dozen sectors, which can describe nearly all of the business activity in that economy. For example, the basic materials sector is the segment of the economy in which companies deal in the business of exploration, processing and selling the basic materials such as gold, silver or aluminum which are used by other sectors of the economy. An industry, on the other hand, describes a much more specific grouping of companies with highly similar business activities. Essentially, industries are created by further breaking down sectors into more defined groupings. Each of the dozen or so sectors will have a varying number of industries, but it can be in the hundreds. For example, the financial sector can be broken down into industries such as asset management, life insurance and Northwest regional banks. The Northwest regional bank industry, which is part of the financial sector, will only contain companies that operate banks in the Northwestern states.

Predictability is key to fairness because debaters must have a reasonable expectation of arguments that are going to be made when going into the round. Solvency advocates don’t check back on this topic, as any literature about the negative effects of wage increases on any industry could function as a solvency advocate, and there still would be hundreds of potential pics.

1. Quality Ground- industry Pics allow the neg to cherry pick a specific advocacy. The neg can focus on a minute part of the literature, especially one that aff studies overlook. Furthermore it takes away the highest quality of aff ground- the solvency read in the AC – by coopting it. Quality ground is key to fairness because debaters require good, persuasive arguments to access the ballot.

Additionally generics against pics don’t apply; my interp accepts that pics are good but puts limits on the pics that my opponent can read. To win the pics good debate he needs to generate specific offense for why the type of pic that he read is good.

CX Checks Bad

. Interpretation—The AC cannot require the negative to clarify 1AC advocacy during cross ex and/or ask the neg to check theory interps in cross examination and/or read (read their spike in the AC)

B. Violation—Call for the AC. It says explicitly, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

C. Standards

a. Advocacy shift—CX checks allows the aff an opportunity to change its vision of a fair debate after the reading of the 1AC. Letting the 1AC flip-flop out of its original positions is unfair because it inevitably leads to the aff cherry picking which theory interps it will concede and not concede depending on who they are debating. Infinite prep solves for mutually exclusive interps – you can pick and frontline the ones you defend.

Also links to strat skew because aff representing the AC differently based on who’s neg artificially denies possible neg options. This kills fairness because when the AC preemptively destroys neg strat, negs ability to coherently respond is shot. Strat skew links to fairness because I’m at a disadvantage if I can’t formulate a strat to the ballot.

1. Theoretical Ground- CX Checks are uniquely bad for theoretical ground because:
2. The Affirmative can sidestep theoretical issues in cross examination and change the function of abusive argumnts. The aff can claim that a nib, a priori, or other abusive argument wasn’t in the AC and the neg misinterpreted the aff argument.
3. You encourage abuse to become more innocuous so it isn’t CX checked. This denies me all in round recourse because I can’t run theory in the NR in a world where I didn’t check in the first speech, allowing infinite abuse.
4. The meaning of “check” is very unclear. Thus, even if the negative tries to check in cross examination, the affirmative can extend the cx checks argument and then explain how the negative insufficiently checked.
5. The affirmative’s theoretical ground becomes qualitatively better because they can prepare for the neg theory argument. The aff can use all of the neg’s prep the intercept the negative’s indict and prepare for it.

Theoretical ground is key to any voter because it dictates my ability to call out abuse and construct offense on theory.

c. Value of CX—Cross-ex is a lost art. Big difference between cross-examining a position and clarifying what the aff is. Point of CX is to do former, not latter. Your norm for debate further encourages debaters to not work at becoming good at questioning their opponents. Also no reason we need to use CX as clarification--you had 6 minutes to clarify what you defended.

Value of CX key to education because CX and the ability to ask good questions is one of the most unique skills garnered in LD, and helps for the rest of life. Key to fairness because it allows aff to waste negative CX time and keeps the neg from gaining concessions.

Alt ROTB Text

1. Interpretation – if the negative introduces a role of the ballot of (x), they must specify and define what it means to (be the/do the/criticize) with minimally a sentence in their role of the ballot.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Critical engagement – The lack of a text destroys critical engagement because
5. I don’t know how to turn the K or link offense back to the role of the ballot, because its unclear what constitutes a better methodology or performance
6. The Neg can delink any turns I make to their advocacy by saying that the role of the ballot actually doesn’t care about my offense, killing critical engagement by discouraging the neg to clash with turns to their advocacy and preventing the aff from garnering offense.

Critical engagement is key to fairness because it ensures that both debaters have ground to engage in a pre fiat discussion, and allows the creation of strategy. Critical engagement independently turns your K framework – if I can’t answer your position you are actively oppressing me.

1. Voter – fairness is the vote because debate is a competitive activity based off skill and wins and losses.

CX Checks Advocacy

1. Interpretation- The negative must read all topicality and theory interpretations indicting the affirmative advocacy in cross examination, giving the aff an opportunity to concede the interp.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Mutually Exclusive Interpretations- Without checking theory on advocacies the aff is locked into a theory debate every round. Even if the aff tries to be fair with its advocacy, the neg can read mutually exclusive shells- ie. Must read a plan, must not read a plan, must/must not spec actor, etc. Preventing the neg from abusing mutually exclusive interps is key to fairness because it allows for the aff constructing and defending positions, and ensures that theory checks abuse.
5. Substantive Clash- Giving the aff a chance to concede the interp in CX maximizes substantive clash. The neg gains access to all the lost ground, solving back for the abuse and allowing for substantive debate. Substantive clash is key to fairness because the judge cannot evaluate the round without clash, otherwise arguments are just ships passing in the night. Furthermore, since the purpose of theory is to promote better clash, theory undermines itself as a tool for fairness if its use is detrimental to it.
6. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.

RVI On I Meets Bad

1. Interpretation- Debaters must not make arguments for RVI’s from I meets on theory interpretations or try to access offense from meeting a theory interp.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Logical Consistency- Allowing RVI’s on I meets encourages debaters to make conflationary arguments. An I meet is a defensive argument- It only says that a debater is consistent with an interp. Thus, an RVI from an I meet conflates a purely defensive argument with an offensive reason to vote debaters down. Logical consistency is key to fairness because illogical arguments prevent the judge from forming a coherent ballot story, encouraging intervention. Logical consistency is key to education because it encourages debaters to construct syllogistic, in depth positions.
5. Theoretical Ground- RVI’s on I meets deter me from checking abuse. This is true becase
6. Debaters running abusive arguments often prep out lists of I meets. This functionally puts a nib on me for every I meet that is read to answer it or else I lose the debate. Thus, it becomes entirely unstrategic to use theory as a recourse to abuse
7. Many abusive arguments are innovated throughout the season, and framing an interpretation against them can be difficult. This rewards innovative abusive debaters, and forces me to engage on the substantive layer unless I have 100% confidence I have crafted a solid interp.

Theoretical ground is key to fairness and education because it provides debaters with the ability to construct norms for the activity.

1. Voter- Fairness is the voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses.
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